Statement

	Rs./Pack	
	Fasigyn 500	Fasigyn D.S.
	25X4'S	2'S
(a) Material cost	47·85	1·53
(b) Conversion cost (as per norms)	0·90	0·03
(c) Packing Material cost	7·20	0·15
(d) Packing charges (as per norms)	0·80	0·06
(e) Ex-factory cost	56·75	1·79
(f) MAPE	115·99	5·11
(g) Excise duty	19·59	0·78
(h) Retail Price	192·33	7·68

Products of M/s. Crews

661. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 752 given in the Rajya Sabha on 25th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that besides Combiflam M/s. Crews were producing number of price controlled formulation in 1984 when the company crossed the exemption limit of Rs. 50 lakhs in sales turn over:

(b) if so, names of such products and the price being charged for each product;

(c) whether it is a fact that this fact and applications submitted by the company for price approval, were kept by the former Assistance Development Commissioer (PI);

(d) if so, the details thereof and action taken thereon;

(e) whether Government have taken any steps to assess the benefit accrued to the company due to connivance of ADC (PI); and

(f) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) ad (b) To the extent information is available, M/s. Crews were producing Alcagal Tablets and Corelgin Tablets besides Combiflam when they crossed the exemption of Rs. 50 lacs.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) to (f) Do not arise.

Overcharging by M/s. Infar

662. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 753 given in the Rajya Sabha on 25th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the M/s. Infar has refused to provide the information and data asked by Government;

(b) since when the company has been selling the product without price approval;

(c) what was the price fixed suo-moto and what was the price being charged by the company;

(d) when the show cause notice was issued to the company and what was their response;

(e) whether Government have taken any action against the company under Essential Commodities Act; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a), (d) to (f) On 27-9-1989, M/s. Infar (India) Ltd. were requested for furnishing certain details to the Government to enable it to calculate the amount of unintended benefit on Dexatopic Cream. The company furnished very limited information. For the remaining information, the company was reminded a number of times. Finally on 26-11-1990, a show cause notice to the company for initiating proceedings against them under relevant provision of DPCO, 1979, 1987 and Essential Commodities Act, 1955 was issued. In response to the show cause notices, the company has reiterated that Dexatopic Cream is a price decontrolled formulation. The comapny has recently been given final opportunity for furnishing the requisite details.

(b) and (c) According to the Company, they started marketing Dexatopic Cream in 1978. The price of Dexatopic cream in different packs fixed on *suo moto* basis and the price that was being charged at that time by the company is as under:

Sl.No.	Name of the Product	Existing price (as per MIMS March, 90) (Rs.)	Price fixed on *suomoto* basis (Rs.)
1	Dexatopix Cream 5 gms. tube.	9·00	3·07
2	Dexatopic Cream 10 gms. tube.	N.A.	5·05
3	Dexatopic Cream 15 gms. tube.	22·00	6·21

Assessment of drug Companies

663. SHRIMATI KAILASH PATI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 781 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 25th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Special Team obtained entire data from all the companies involved in Supdeme Court case;

(b) if so, what are the reasons and difficulties on account of which the assessment of liability in regard to eight companies post January 1984 period have not been completed;

(c) whether it is a fact that Supreme Court gave judgement an early 1987 directing Government to recover the unintended benefit within the specific period;

(d) if so, what are the details of directive and what was the time period given in the direction; and

(e) what is the present position and by when the assessment upto August, 1987 of these eight companies would be completed?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) Soon after the receipt of Supreme Court's Judgements in 1987, a Special Team and a Price Review Committee (PRC) were constituted, for the purpose of collection and compilation of requisite data, review of prices and determination of liabilities of the companies involved in Supreme Court cases. In view, however, of receipt of complaints alleging act of omssission and commission on the part of the Special Team and the PPC, it was decided to review the computations and recommendations made by them. For the purpose of review some additional data and or reconciliation of the already available data was